



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

**Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 26th, 1881.**

The Society assembled at New Haven, on Wednesday, Oct. 26, 1881, at 3 o'clock P. M., in the usual place, the Library of the Divinity School. The chair was taken by the president, Prof. S. Wells Williams, LL.D., of New Haven, who in a few words returned thanks to the Society for the honor done him in electing him to fill the place made vacant by the resignation of Prof. Salisbury.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read, the Committee of Arrangements reported that they had accepted on behalf of the Society an invitation from the President to hold the evening session at his house, in a social way.

On the part of the Directors, the announcement was made that the Annual meeting would be helden in Boston, on Wednesday, May 24th, 1882, Professors Toy and Abbot being the Committee of Arrangements for it. They also recommended the election to Corporate membership of the following persons:

Prof. Francis Brown, of New York;  
Mr. H. F. Burton, of Rochester, N. Y.;  
Prof. B. L. Gildersleeve, of Baltimore, Md.;  
Rev. J. S. Jenckes, Jr., of Des Moines, Iowa;  
Rev. S. D. Peet, of Clinton, Wisc.;  
Prof. Calvin Thomas, of Ann Arbor, Mich.

These gentlemen were then elected, in accordance with the recommendation.

The Committee of Publication stated that the first Part of Volume xi. of the Journal would doubtless be in the hands of members before the next Annual meeting.

On motion of the Librarian, a Committee was appointed to consider, in conjunction with the authorities of Yale College Library and of the Yale Divinity School, the transfer of the Society's Library to the premises of the latter.

Extracts from the Correspondence of the past half-year were read:

A member of the family of Professor Benfey, of Göttingen (an Honorary Member of the Society, deceased since its last meeting), writes from Berlin, expressing the hope of the family that his library, in accordance with his own earlier intimation, may be purchased entire by some American institution. It has been pronounced by authority of high rank "unusually complete in the departments which it represents."

Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass., has written repeatedly, urging the importance of putting on record the literary history of the Arabic translation of the Bible, before it shall be too late. The Corresponding Secretary said that he had referred the subject to Prof. Isaac H. Hall of Philadelphia (formerly for a time at Beirut), who had promised to take initiatory steps, at least, toward satisfying the probably widely felt desire to which Prof. Jenks gives expression.

Dr. D. B. McCarter, formerly of China, writes from New York accompanying the gift of certain Buddhist documents obtained in Japan, partly in Indian characters, and explaining their nature and value. They are:

1. A Sūtra, called by Dr. Eitel (Handbook of Chinese Buddhism) the *suvarna prabhāsa jinarāja*, one of the nine *dharma*s of the Nepalese, and ascribed to Cakyamuni himself. The volume contains the Sanskrit text of the work, with interlinear Japanese transliteration, and the Chinese version and comments, also interlined with Japanese.

2. A syllabary of the Sanskrit characters used in China and Japan, with explanations in the languages of those countries. It is a Japanese edition of the Chinese work called by Eitel (as above) the *Siddha-vastu*, or first chapter of the *Fan-chang*, a work in twelve parts attributed to Brahma. It is also noticed by Mr. Satow, in the "Chrysanthemum" (Yokohama) for Jan. 1881, p. 17, under the name of *Shittan Ji-ki*.

3. A rubbing (about six feet by three) of an inscribed *dhāraṇī*, or Buddhist formula, in Indian characters, from the temple of Kwannon (Kwan-yin), at Asak'sa, Tokio. The Chinese title over it is the same with that of the Keu-Yung Kwan inscription, described by Mr. A. Wylie in the Journ. Roy. As. Soc. for 1870 (Vol. v., pp. 14 ff.); namely, "Great *Dhāraṇī* of the honored diadem on Buddha's cranium." It contains just over 400 characters. Accompanying it is a manuscript transcription with interlined Japanese transliteration, and also a Chinese transliteration, both made by a Japanese scholar.

4. A photograph of the *tolo* (*dhāra*) pall described by Dr. Jamieson in the Trans. No.-China Branch Roy. As. Soc'y for December, 1865.

The following communications were presented to the meeting in the afternoon and evening :

1. Notice of F. Delitzsch's views as to the alleged site of Eden, by Prof. C. H. Toy, of Cambridge.

Delitzsch's recent work entitled "*Wo lag das Paradies?*" is distinguished above all its predecessors on the same subject by fulness of learning and sobriety of judgment; and its notes and appendices furnish a very valuable collection of geographical and linguistic remarks. After a criticism of other theories, the author points out that the writer in Genesis ii. had in mind an actually existing place as his Eden, and deals with known geographical data; his tone, as well as that of Ezekiel, is purely historical; he shows for himself, and assumes for his readers, the same sort of knowledge of Pishon and Gihon, of Havilah and Kush, as of Tigris and Euphrates and Asshur. Delitzsch regards the essential identity of the Babylonian and the Old Testament cosmogonies as satisfactorily demonstrated; nor does he regard it as open to question that the Babylonians and not the Hebrews were its originators. Wherever, then, the Babylonians placed Eden, there the Hebrews placed it when they received the story. And if they received the latter at the time of the exile, in the 6th century before Christ, as Delitzsch holds, it must agree with the Babylonian doctrine of the same period, which was preserved in documents going back to the earliest known times of Babylonian (Accadian) civilization. We have every reason to presume that there is geographical consistency in the Babylonian account. The problem, then, is a simple one: what four rivers are there, branching from one common stream, two of them being the Tigris and Euphrates, and the other two in close proximity with the lands of Kush and Havilah? Such a group can of course be found only in Babylonia; and, as no four rivers proper now exist there, the theory has been suggested and worked out by various authorities, that the Pishon and Gihon are to be recognized in some of the numerous canals with which that region was filled. Any theory placing Eden below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates is excluded by the fact, brought prominently out by our author, that in the 6th century B. C. the two rivers did not unite before reaching the Persian Gulf.

Delitzsch's view then is, that Havilah is the northeastern part of the Syrian desert, touching on the Babylonian Euphrates, and traversed by the canal Pallakopas, in which is to be recognized the Pishon of Genesis. The Asiatic Kush he

identifies with the territory of the Elamitic Sumerians, dwelling on the north-eastern and northern shore of the Persian Gulf; through it runs the Shat-en-Nil, which is the Gihon. The Garden of Eden is the Karduniash, the so-called Isthmus, watered by the Euphrates, the left bank of which is here considerably higher than the right bank of the Tigris. To the dwellers in that region the Euphrates would seem to be the one river, from which parted not only the two great canals, but also the Tigris, which was connected with the Euphrates by a cross-canal. The two canals were probably old river-beds, and, being navigable and very ancient, might naturally be called rivers.

Prof. Toy presented in some detail the evidence relied on by Delitzsch to establish the truth of the various parts of this theory; and, while pronouncing it to come nearer than any hitherto proposed to meeting the requirements of the narrative in Genesis, proceeded to point out certain respects in which the author's statements do not seem to be entirely satisfactory.

1. There must be doubt about the positions assigned to Havilah and Kush. According to Delitzsch, Havilah extends from a point south of Judah to the bank of the Euphrates, and farther north than Babylon. Such a position for the Joktanite Arabs is somewhat surprising, especially as the tribe or region Yobab, which follows Havilah in Gen. x. 29, must have lain still farther north. Unfortunately the datum in Gen. x. 30 ("the dwelling of the Joktanites was from Mesha to Sephor, a mount of the east") is too indefinite to help much. Nor can it be said to be made out that Kush is identical with Babylonia. The genealogical statement in Gen. x. 7 confines Kush to Arabia (Havilah also being a son of Kush), and elsewhere in the Old Testament it means either Arabia or Ethiopia. Ezekiel, who shows so many points of contact with the 10th chapter of Genesis, and who was probably well acquainted with Babylonian geography, uses Kush of Ethiopia only. The fact that Nimrod, to whom is assigned the kingdom of Babylonia, is said to be a son of Kush, would hardly be sufficient ground for assigning the name Kush to Babylonia.

2. There is further the meaning of the participle כָּבֵד, 'encircling,' which is used in describing the geographical relation of the streams Pishon and Gihon to Havilah and Kush respectively. Delitzsch remarks that the word may mean 'traversed,' but this is not borne out by the usage of the Old Testament; in none of the passages that he cites will the verb admit this signification. In what sense can the Pallakopas be said to "encircle the whole land of Havilah?" It might be properly said, perhaps, to pass along its frontier, to form its boundary; but, if this were meant, the expression would be different, as in the case of the Tigris, which is described as flowing "in front of Assyria." There is a difficulty here which Delitzsch's exposition does not remove.

3. Again, the relation of the four branches or "heads" to the main river involves difficulty. It does not clearly appear how a Hebrew writer, knowing the geography of Assyria and Babylonia, could call the Tigris a branch of the Euphrates. Delitzsch himself dwells on the distinctness of the geographical knowledge of this region possessed by its inhabitants, and this I see no reason to call in question. But the plainer their knowledge, the more certain it must have been to them that the Tigris was an independent stream, in some places greater than the Euphrates, and not at all to be regarded as one of its branches.

Further, we must ask why, if the Euphrates was the main Eden-river, it was not called by its name. A river, says the narrative, went out of Eden to water the garden, and thence parted into four streams, of which the Tigris and the Euphrates are two. As the writer is giving geographical details, why does he not say distinctly that this river was the Euphrates? His silence cannot be attributed to ignorance, or to geographical carelessness; it is evident that he is ready to tell all that he knows of the locality. As the fourth branch is given as the well-known river Euphrates, one does not see why the main stream should not be named, if it was known as the Euphrates. Possibly the writer might have thought it geographically inconsistent to give the same name to the main river and to one of its branches; but we should hardly look for such scrupulousness.

Delitzsch's theory is a strong and well supported one, but it labors under these difficulties, which must be set aside before it can be accepted.

2. On Non-diphthongal *e* and *o* in Sanskrit, by Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, of Baltimore, Md.

The discussion starts with the statement that it is impossible to explain the *e* of the so-called contracted weak perfect stems, like *sēd-* in *sedimá* etc., as diphthongs. The type of these perfects is older than the beginning of the separate life of the Indian languages, and any explanation of it made for Sanskrit alone is insufficient; and if the *e* in forms like these is explained as a diphthong, the same explanation must hold good for all other languages that exhibit this method of forming perfect stems, which is not the case. The *e* of this type is now generally held to be long *ē*, the result of short *ɛ* plus the tone of a sonant consonant, which has itself fallen out, but left its tone to preserve the long quantity of the syllable: e. g. Skt. *sedimá* stands for \**sē-sd-imā*, \**sē-(z)d-imā*, where the *z* in falling out left its tone behind it; this lengthened the *ɛ* preceding it into *ē*. In the same way Latin *sedimus* and Gothic *sētum* must be referred to the Indo-European stem \**sē-2d-*, *sēd-*; and in these languages the explanation of the *ē* as a diphthong is simply impossible. In *sedimá* the *ē* is Indo-European; it has been generated in the same manner within the history of Sanskrit itself in *edhī*, which cannot be explained except by referring it to \**es-dhī*, \**ē(z)-dhī*; so also in *dēhī* and *dhehī*, which are equal to \**dez-dhī* and \**ghez-dhī* (Zend *dazdi*), and in a few others, most of which are treated by Johannes Schmidt, Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxv. 60 fg.

The explanation of these *e* as long *ē*, the result of short *ɛ* plus the tone of a sonant consonant, is supported by the entirely parallel way in which long *i* and *ū* are the results of short *ɪ* plus the same tone, which a sonant has left as compensation on falling out. A case in Indo-European times is exhibited in the present stem *sid-* of Skt. *si'dati*, Zd. *hidaiti*, Lat. *sido*; which is equal to \**si(z)d-*, precisely as *sēd-* is equal to *sē(z)d-*; within the Sanskrit itself *mīdhá* = Gr. *μοθός*; *nīdā*, 'nest,' stands for \**nīzdā*; the participles *tidhá*, *mīdhá*, for \**līzh-tō*, \**mīzh-tā*. For the word *vīdū* affinity with Latin *vīridis* for \**visidis* is suggested, so that its *ī* is again the result of compensation for short *ɪ*. In the same way long *ū* in cases like *ādhā* and *mūdhā*, *dādābhā* and *dūnāqā*, etc., is the result of short *ū* compensated by the tone of the sibilant which has fallen out (\**dūz-dābhā* etc.).

It has been seen that long *ē*, *i*, and *ū*, when the result of compensatory lengthening, have originated from their corresponding short vowels *ɛ*, *i*, and *ū*; this creates a presumption in favor of an attempt to explain the *ō* as a like result of compensatory lengthening.

The word *sōdāra* is especially interesting, because it is so different from all the numerals with which it could be associated mentally; there is no analogical numeral formation by which its *ō* could be accounted for, and it must be explained as the result of organic growth. And *sōdāra* is naturally explained from *sōz-dāra*, where the *ō* has been changed from *ɛ* by the *v* which preceded it, as in Zend *kshivas* and in the Greek inscriptive form *reξ*.

The peculiar nominatives in the Rig-Veda—*avayād-* from the stem *avayāj'*, *purodā-* from the stem *purodā-*—and the nom. *cvetavās* of the grammarians, cannot be explained organically as coming from the several stems plus the *s* of the nominative. They can only be analogical formations, and the only forms which could have given rise to them are the *bh*-cases, *avayobhis*, *purodabbhis*, and *cvetavobhis*, which are preserved by the grammarians. It is found that root-stems which have long *ā* in the strong cases often show *ā* in the weak ones; that this short *ā* is probably the representative of *ō* or equal to *ō* is shown by Greek declensions like *κλώψ κλοπός*; *σόφρων σόφρονος*; *δῶψ το δῶτι*. We assume then that before the *bh*-endings (as *avayōz-bhis*, *purodōz-bhis* and *cvetavōz-bhis*) the sonant sibilant has fallen out as in *sō-dāra*, and compensated the short *ō* by lengthening it into *ā*; so far as can be seen, forms like these, and only such, could have given rise to -*as*-nominatives, *avayās* etc., on the basis of a proportion *aṅgirobhīs*: *aṅgirās* : : *avayobhis*: *avayās*.

The main point of the paper is the explanation of the change of final *as* into *ā*. The *ā* in such cases is not a diphthong; it is long *ā*, the result of short *ō* plus the tone of the sonant sibilant *z* which has fallen out. Short Indo-European *ō* is accordingly not entirely dead upon Indian ground, any more than short I. E. *ɛ*; both have been preserved in certain cases as long *ē* and *ā*. The euphonic change

of a sound-group *açvō dravati* differs from that of a sound-group *ēdhi* only in the quality of the short vowel which preceded the change: \**açvoz dravati* is the historic precursor of \**açvō dravati*, precisely as \**ezdhi* of *ēdhi*.

There are great difficulties besetting this explanation; but they are not to be regarded as insurmountable. In the first place, final *as* does not correspond to European *os* alone, but also to European *es*; in the latter case it ought to appear as *ē*: \**agnayē dahanti* for \**agnayēz dahanti*. That this state of things once did actually exist in India appears to be rendered strongly probable by certain dialectic phenomena. In the Māgadhi-dialect, original final *as* generally appears as *ē*; cf. Hemacandra iv. 288, and Vararuci's *Prākṛtu-prakāśa* xi. 10. And if we were disposed to distrust the historical legitimacy of the phenomenon in a late and artificial dialect like the Māgadhi, we are convinced that this final *ē* is a linguistic fact, because the inscriptions found in various parts of the old Magadha district show the same *ē*. Such are the inscriptions of Açoka in Dhauli; they have final *ē*, while the same inscriptions at Girnar in Guzerat show final *o*. The reason why the original difference between *açvō dravati* and \**agnayē dahanti* was lost is clear. As soon as the difference between \**açvōs* and \**agnayēs* before surds was wiped out, because both short *ō* and short *ē* were written as short *ā*, there was no longer any basis for the differentiation of *açvō* and *agnayē*; one or the other had to disappear; that the *ē*-forms usually succumbed may probably be brought into connection with the fact that final Skt. *as*=Eur. *os* is about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times as common as final Skt. *as*=Eur. *es*. When this disappearance of *ē* for *as* began, it is almost impossible to say. On the one hand, there are many facts that would seem to prove that the process was started in Aryan times, when the Indian and Iranian languages were still one; it is a *fait accompli* in the Vedic Samhitās; in most of the Prākrit dialects and in Pāli, *ō* is simply substituted for *as* without reference to the character of the following sound; the Iranian has carried the process of extending the *ō*-forms on the one hand farther than Pāli, namely into composition; on the other hand, the *as* has survived before enclitics: *manāñhō*, but *manaiñhaçca*. But there are facts also which appear to prove that the *ō* accomplished the task of crowding out the *ē* separately in the various dialects of the Indo-Iranian languages; such are the victory of *ē* over *ō* in Magadha, and the distinct traces of *ē* by the side of *ō* in Iran, which will be pointed out below.

The form in which stems in *as* (*manas*) in Skt. appear before the *bh*-endings has deviated from the original. For here, as in the case of final *as*, we must be guided by the vocalism of Europe; this is unequivocal. Homeric ἔρθεσφν, στήθεσφν, etc. point to Indian forms like \**manebhis* etc. Of these there is no trace; *ō* has here also crowded out *ē*. But the Zend has preserved the historical form most strikingly: *raocbyō* from *raocanh*, *avibis* from *avañh*, etc., both in the Gāthā-dialect and in the later Avestan. The position of this *ē* in the language points with perfect distinctness to a genesis from a short *ē* (Hübschmann's and Justi's *e*), and through this *e*, to a connection with simple Skt. *u*; on the other hand, the *ē* just as clearly shows affinity with that *ō* which in the later Avesta alone stands for final *as*, and is actually found to interchange with it in the Gāthās, and like it to exchange with *as*; for when we have forms like *manē* for *manō*, *vacē* for *vacō*, *yēkē* (*kas-nā*), we are bound to recognize here that stage in which final *os* and *ēs* are still both in existence, although the laws with regard to the use of one or the other have been necessarily wiped out along with the difference between *ē* and *ō*; the *ē* of *raocēbis* is the same *ē* as the final *ē* in the Gāthās, and has escaped that levelling process which in the later Avesta has substituted final *ō* for *ē* everywhere at the end of a word by virtue of its more protected position. It is interesting and fortunate that there is no possibility of explaining *raocēbis* etc. as analogical formations, because the Zend has, unlike its sisters in India, separate forms for long *ē* and *ō* clearly differentiated from the *i* and *u* diphthongs. While an Indian \**rocelhis* would be subject to the suspicion that it had in some way become contaminated by the *a*-declension, or was an *a*-formation parallel with the *as*-formation, as is often enough the case, such an eventuality is here warded off by *daērāéibyō*, *arethaéibyō*, etc.

There remains an exception in Sanskrit, contained in the later rule, that final *as* before *ā* changes to *ō*, and the following initial *ā* is dropped. The difficulty lies in the change of a syllable short by nature and position into a long one; there is

here no ground for compensatory lengthening. It is believed that in unravelling the meshes of this exception the last trace of a value of final *ās* equal to *īs* will be detected on Vedic ground. In the later language, not only final *ō* from *as* produces the elision of initial *ā*, but any other *o*: and, what is more, *ē* also produces the same effect. We must however turn to the earlier Vedic language before we can begin to explain; and here the complexion of the two rules we are dealing with is changed materially. Final *as* is still written *o* before *ā*, and we find this *o* again in juxtaposition with final *e*, for in the Veda also the initial *ā* is elided after *e* and *o*: only with this difference, that the elision is here the rare exception, not the rule. It is impossible to explain the elision after *e* as a mere analogical process, an imitation of the properties of a parallel sound, the *o*, because we are dealing with an ill-regulated tendency, itself too vague and undefined to furnish the firm foundation of facts likely to exercise the necessary attraction. It will be necessary then to recognize the fact that the elision after *e*, just as that after *o*, stands on its own basis, and to explain how two sounds of a character so widely different (*o* is almost always the product of *as*, *e* always a historical diphthong) show the same tendency in the earlier language to elide a following *ā*.

The organic parallelism of *e* and *o* in early times is proved by a still more striking fact. A. Kuhn has shown, in his acute investigations on Vedic language as exhibited by metrical conditions, that in the Rig-Veda final *e* and *o* before vowels are themselves short (see especially Kuhn & Schleicher's *Beiträge*, iii. 118 ff.). His proof, as far as *ō* is concerned, may be called almost a linguistic necessity, there being no reason for a lengthening of final *ās* before *a*; but what is to be done with the diphthong *e*, which is nothing but a diphthong in historical times: what is the reason of its short quantity?

It is believed that the following explanation will be found to remove the difficulties involved: 1. Final *ōs* and *ās* simply dropped the *s* before vowels, whether *ā* or any other vowel followed. As the Indian alphabets possessed no signs for either short *ē* or *ō*, they had to put signs actually existing in their places: before all vowels except *ā* the short *ā* was chosen, the sign being indeed insufficient to render the color of the vowels, but doing perfect justice to the quantity; before *ā*, the disinclination to allow two identical vowels to follow upon one another was probably the motive which led to another possible expedient, by which the vocalic color was preserved, but the quantity sacrificed in writing, by employing the signs *o* and *e*; this, it is believed, is the starting point from which the remarkable juxtaposition of *e* and *o* in the euphonic rules must be explained. 2. These *ē* and *ō*, coinciding graphically with the long and diphthongal *ē* and *ō*, ended by attracting them to their own condition, so that every *e* and *o*, without reference to its origin, was pronounced short before *ā*; but then, also, the other vowels, which indeed would occur almost only after *e*, were drawn into this rule; so that the shortening of *e* and *o* took place before all vowels. This is the condition of things which Kuhn finds; and it may be added, as a valuable proof that this shortening does not take place on the principle *vocalis ante vocalem corripitur*, that in a few instances the short values occur before consonants also. 3. Before the period from which our Vedic material dates, the final *ō* (written *ō*) for *ōs* had also absorbed the final *ē* (written *ē*) for *ēs*, precisely as in the case of final long *ō* and *ē*; so that only those *e* were left which could preserve their existence from the fact that they occurred also in other connections than merely before initial vowels: namely, the diphthongal *e*, which had been drawn secondarily into the treatment as short vowel. We have then the last vestige of final *ēs* on Vedic and Sanskrit ground in the short value of *e* in the Veda, and also in the sporadic elision of initial *a* following. 4. The vanishing of initial *ā* after *e* and *o* has thus far been called by a name which for the later language is well and expressive enough, namely elision. That it is however in reality not elision is clearly enough to be recognized from the fact that the resulting accentuation takes account of the *a*; the tone of the *ē* or *ō* that results shows that the *a* has been united with the *e* and *o*. Two peculiarities are then connected with this phenomenon: first, that *e* and *o* do not, as might be expected before vowels, resolve themselves into semiconsonantal groups; second, that the combination occurs so sparingly in the Rig-Veda. The first difficulty falls aside, because the *o* and *e* are not diphthongal, but short *ō* and *ē*; the law according to which these combine with following *a* then lies before us: Short

ɛ and ɔ combine with following a to long ē and ɔ, subject to the same accentual laws for the result as other combinations of two short vowels; the infrequency of the union of these short ɛ and ɔ in the Veda is simply due to the fact that in both cases a euphonic process has preceded, and the hiatus which is the result of a euphonic process is, as is well known, regularly allowed to remain, the secondary contraction being of rarer occurrence. There is to be sure a great difference in the chronology of the hiatus: that between ɔ and ă is made before our very eyes; that between ɛ and ă appears as the last faint reflex of final ēs, kept alive only by the fortunate fact that this ɛ had attracted to itself by analogy the diphthongal e-sounds, which were not liable to succumb to the inroads of the stronger sister-sound o.

3. On the Aboriginal Miao-tsz' Tribes of southwestern China, with Remarks on the Nestorian Tablet of Si-ngan fu, by Prof. S. Wells Williams, of New Haven.

Before taking up the proper subject of his paper, Dr. Williams called attention to the fact that this year is the 1100th anniversary of the erection of the celebrated Nestorian monument in Si-ngan, the ancient capital of China, and recalled to the recollection of the Society the principal facts in its remarkable history. A recent rubbing taken from the tablet itself was exhibited, to show its continued good condition. The monument was visited in 1866 by two English missionaries, Messrs. Williamson and Lees, who found it built into a brick wall in such a way as to shield it from the weather. This had been done in 1859, by a Chinese named Han Tai-hwa, who had added a brief inscription at the side, stating his regret at its former neglected condition, and his desire to preserve it. In 1874, three American missionaries again visited it, and obtained rubbings from its face; they also learned that the citizens of Si-ngan were well aware of the age and importance of the tablet. The brickwork put up in 1859 had, however, been meanwhile destroyed by some Imperial soldiers; and Rev. Arthur Smith says that the stone now stands in an open court without any shelter. Five other tablets stand in a row with it. The demand for rubbings from it is a partial guarantee that it will be carefully preserved. Its material is said to be a kind of silicious limestone. The capital Si-ngan was abandoned in A. D. 904 for Loh-yang in Honan, and was left in a ruinous condition. The tablet was probably placed in the cathedral church of the Nestorians there, and if this church was destroyed, or pulled down for its materials, its roof and other parts not worth carrying off would furnish plenty of earth and debris to cover the stone as deep as it was found in 1625. The notice of its discovery at that time gives no particulars as to its situation; but the hypothesis above made would account for its good condition. The fact that tablets of a similar character are still set up in temples and burial-places all over China leads to the hope that others may yet be found connected with the Nestorian religion; for it would be strange if only this single relic of a faith that existed in the Middle Kingdom for about eight centuries had ever been erected. Rather it may be regarded as an earnest of what future explorations will reveal, when they come to be prosecuted by competent men, working at their leisure. The recent discoveries in Western Asia of various relics in the form of inscriptions, substructions, and monuments, proving the existence of ancient nations like the Hittites and Accadians, has stimulated the researches of qualified scholars everywhere in that region. In such researches, the discovery of a single stone with a legible inscription opens the path to a wider field than the excavation of a whole city showing only the foundations of houses or the slabs of sidewalks. The Moabitic stone did its best work when it added its testimony to the authenticity of the story of King Mesha, in the second book of Kings—a testimony given out, so to speak, at its last gasp. In Eastern Asia, sovereigns and great men have depended more on literary records than on great buildings and monuments to perpetuate their history; and consequently we have hitherto few epigraphic memorials of their existence. But the probabilities are strong that further search will bring more of them to light in China, when foreigners and educated natives are able to look for them.

Dr. Williams then exhibited a collection of forty water-color paintings of figures

of as many tribes of Miao-ts'z', by a Chinese artist. They were obtained by him in Peking. Such sketches are not rare in China, and he had seen others superior in execution to these. To each picture is added a short description of the tribe, and translations of several of these were read. They do not give much information as to the origin or numbers of the delineated tribes, but are rather designed to direct the reader's attention to their leading characteristics. Volume xiv. of the Chinese Repository contains the complete translation of a like series of descriptions accompanying pictures; these are briefer, and the illustrations of inferior workmanship. The Miao-ts'z' have shown no desire to record their history and sufferings; and ages of degradation have reduced them to the fragmentary condition in which they now appear.

The name Miao was early applied in Chinese books to the aborigines who refused obedience to the Emperor. In the Book of Records they are called the *San Miao*; and they successfully resisted the control of the Chinese as early as B. C. 1000. Some of them are also termed *Nan Man*, and occupy portions of the present Hunan and Kweichau provinces; most of them were first conquered about B. C. 250-220.

The Miao-ts'z' are connected in their racial affinities with the Laos and Lolas people of Siam and Burmah. Their national designation is *Li* or *Lo*; one of these names is still retained in *Li-mu*, the present designation of those dwelling in the island of Hainan; the other is found in the last part of *Siem-lo*, the common Chinese name for Siam, from which we derive our own. The Miao-ts'z' themselves use both *Li* and *Lo* for some of their tribes. Dr. Edkins of Peking has compared many common terms found in twelve Chinese vocabularies of Miao-ts'z' words, contained in two topographies of Kweichau and Kwangsi provinces, and other special Chinese works on these tribes.

Reference was made to the visit, in 1870, of the late German missionary Krolczyk to a tribe called *Yao-jin*, dwelling in the northwest of Kwangtung province, in Lien-chau. (See Missionary Recorder, vol. iii., pp. 62, 93, 126.) The great precautions these mountaineers took to prevent strangers entering their districts showed their fear of the inroads of the Chinese, and their long habits of seclusion. In their social and domestic life they have sunk far below the Chinese dwelling in the lowlands, and now maintain their individuality chiefly by their seclusion. The total number of Miao-ts'z' still left in China cannot be guessed with any probability; I should place it at less than a million. The French traveler Mohout, who died on his journey from Cambodia to Hankow, thus fairly sums up the intellectual status of this race: "I am getting tired of these people, a race of children, heartless and unenergetic. I sigh and look everywhere for a man, and cannot find one. Here all tremble at the stick, and the enervating climate makes them incredibly apathetic."

As selections from a number of the descriptions read, the following ten will show the small value of the information they give.

"1. The *Yang-tung Lo-han*.—These are found in Li-ping prefecture [in the southeast of Kweichau]. The men are farmers and carry on trade; the women tie their hair in a slovenly manner, and insert a wooden comb before the temple. Ear-rings are made of gold and silver hanging in a chain. They bind a double girdle which meets on the back. Sometimes they wear long trowsers and short skirts; at other times long skirts and no trowsers. They rear silkworms and weave brocade silk. On festival days they wash their hair with perfumed water. Among the Miao and Mau tribes, few are found that excel this one.

"2. The *Kih-mang Miao*.—This tribe lives in the townships Kin-choh in Kwang-shun chau [near the capital of Kweichau]. The people select overhanging cliffs in which they dig caves for dwellings: some of them are over a hundred fathoms high: bamboo ladders are used for ascending and descending. They have no plows drawn by oxen, but use iron hoes; they cover in the seed without plowing. Men play on the *sang*, and thus find their mates. After a child is born, the marriage presents are sent to the woman's parents. When a relative dies, they sing and dance, calling it fighting the corpse. When the cuckoo's note is heard the next spring, the whole family raise a lamentable cry, saying, The birds have come back, but our parents will never return to us.

"5. *Ling-kia Miao*.—This tribe resides in Li-po district [in Tu-yun fu, near the

south border]. All classes of men and women cover their heads entirely with blue kerchiefs. In the eleventh month the unmarried youth dance and sing, each selecting the partner who pleases them. Whenever a child is born the girl returns with her partner, but no wedding takes place if otherwise.

"6. *Tung-kia Miao*, or Cave-dwelling Miao.—This tribe also lives in Li-po district [in Kweichau]. They wear black garments reaching only to the knees. On New Year's day they place fish, meat, spirits, and rice in wooden trenches, and thus offer them. They live near the streams, and raise fine cotton. The women are industrious weavers. The men can talk Chinese, but do not know how to read the characters. When they have any business, they use notched sticks for letters.

"7. *Shui-kia Miao*, or Water-dwelling Miao.—These live in Li-po district. The men are expert in fishing and hunting. The women dress in ribbed skirts, which are short, and mixed all around with flowered pieces. At New Year's men and women assemble in crowds to dance; it is allowable for them to marry without observing the rites.

"8. *Luh-ngeh tsz'*, or Six-forehead people.—These live [in the west of Kweichau province near Yunnan], in Ta-ting prefecture, in Wei-ning district; there are both black and white people. The men braid the hair in a pointed knot. Women wear long garments but no petticoats. The dead are buried in coffins; and after a year's interval they invite their relatives to come on a lucky day around the grave, when they make an offering of an animal and spirits. The grave is opened, and the bones taken from the coffin, brushed and washed clean, and then re-interred, wrapped in cloth. After one or two years they repeat this act, and so till seven times are fulfilled; then they cease. If one of the family is taken sick, they say, 'Your ancestor's bones are not clean;' and take them out to wash them. Hence they are called Wash-bone Miao.

"11. *Kiu-ming Kiu-sing Miao*, or Nine name-surname Miao.—These live in Tuh-shan district, in southern Kweichau. They are of a treacherous and violent disposition; they often falsely assume other peoples' names and surnames. At weddings and funerals they kill oxen and assemble to drink; when excited by drink they quarrel, and those who receive wounds are willing to settle the matter by receiving cattle. The women cultivate the land, raising hill sorghum for food.

"12. *Yé-tau Miao*, or Gentlemen Head Miao.—These live in Ku-chau, in the southeast of Kweichau. They use no oxen in plowing, but take men to drag it. The first day of the eleventh moon is a great festival. The women braid their hair and adorn it with garlands made of silver wire shaped like a fan, fastening them with a long skewer shaped like a guitar. In marriage, a paternal aunt's daughter must marry her cousin, and have a dowry of money. If they are too weak to work themselves, this money enables them to hire a son or grandson to work. If they have no marriageable son, the girl must allow the uncle to arrange the match for her and take the dowry, which is hence called the niece's dowry. If this be not done, he will not permit her to marry.

"15. *Tsing-kiang Heh Miao*, or Black Miao of Clear-water River.—The men dress in red cloth, the women in black. They bind their hair with silver bands and wear large ear-rings. They wear wide trowsers and are fond of dressing in particolored garments like play-actors. On pleasant days in spring they go to high cliffs, carrying liquor with them which they drink out of cows' horns. They are very licentious.

"16. *Lau-kü Heh Miao*, or the Black Miao who live in lofts.—These live in Pah-chai in Tan-kiang ting. The men work hard at plowing. Women make hair-pins of rams' horns. They prefer to live in the upper story. When a death occurs, the body is coffined and kept; after twenty years have passed, the whole village choose a lucky day, and bury from ten to a hundred coffins at once. A hall is erected by the people to worship the dead in, called Demon's Hall; whatever is placed there is regarded as sacred, for it would be unlucky to take anything. These people rear animals; they live in the lofts, and the stock is tended below."

4. On the so-called Henotheism of the Veda, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

The following is a succinct view of the subject as presented in this paper :

We have long been accustomed to class religions as monotheistic and polytheistic, according as they recognize the existence of one personal God or of a plurality of such, and to call pantheistic a faith which, rejecting the personality of a Creator, accepts the creation itself as divine, or holds everything to be God. The last of these is the one least definite in character, and confessedly latest in the order of development; nor has it any popular or ethnic value; it is essentially a philosophic creed, and limited to the class of philosophers. The other two, monotheism and polytheism, divide between them the whole great mass of the world's religions. As to which of the two is the earlier, and foundation of the other, opinions are, and will doubtless long or always remain, divided, in accordance with the views taken respecting the origin and first history of the human race. But it does not appear doubtful that they will settle down into two forms: either man and his first conditions of life are a miraculous creation, and monotheism a miraculous communication to him, a revelation; or, if he is a product of secondary causes, of development, and had to acquire his knowledge of the divine and his relations to it in the same way with the rest of his knowledge, namely by observation and reflection, then polytheism is necessarily antecedent to monotheism; it is simply inconceivable that the case should be otherwise—nor can we avoid allowing everywhere a yet earlier stage which does not even deserve the name of religion, which is only superstition.

Nearly all the religions of men are polytheistic; monotheisms are the rare exception : namely—1. The Hebrew monotheism, with its continuators, *a.* Christianity, and *b.* Mohammedanism ; and 2. the Persian monotheism, or Zoroastrianism (so far as this does not deserve rather to be called a dualism): the former apparently has behind it a general Semitic polytheism ; the latter certainly grows out of the Aryan or Indo-Iranian belief in many gods. That they should be isolated products of the natural development of human insight is entirely in harmony with other parts of human history: thus, for example, all races have devised instruments, but few have reduced the metals to service, and the subjugation of steam is unique ; all races have acquired language, but few have invented writing: indeed, all the highest elements of civilization arise at single points, and are passed from one community to another.

A single author, of much influence—namely, M. Müller—has recently endeavoured to introduce a new member, with a new name, into this classification: he calls it *henotheism* (or *kathenotheism*), ‘the worship of one god at a time,’ as we may render it. The germ of his doctrine is to be found in his History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature ; where, after speaking of the various gods of the Veda, he says (p. 532, 1st ed., 1859): “When these individual gods are invoked, they are not conceived as limited by the power of others, as superior or inferior in rank. Each god is to the mind of the suppliant as good as all [*i. e.* as any of?] the gods. He is felt at the time as a real divinity—as supreme and absolute, in spite of the necessary limitations which, to our mind, a plurality of gods must entail on every single god. All the rest disappear for a moment from the vision of the poet, and he only who is to fulfil their desires stands in full light before the eyes of the worshippers.” And later (p. 526), after quotation of specimens: “When Agni, the lord of fire, is addressed by the poet, he is spoken of as the first god, not inferior even to Indra. While Agni is invoked, Indra is forgotten ; there is no competition between the two, nor any rivalry between them or other gods. This is a most important feature in the religion of the Veda, and has never been taken into consideration by those who have written on the history of ancient polytheism.” In his later works, where he first introduces and reiterates and urges the special name *henotheism*, Müller's doctrine assumes this form: (Lect. on Sc. of Rel., p. 141) that a henotheistic religion “represents each deity as independent of all the rest, as the only deity present in the mind of the worshipper at the time of his worship and prayer,” this character being “very prominent in the religion of the Vedic poets;” and finally (Or. and Growth of Rel., lect. vi.), that henotheism is “a worship of single gods,” and that polytheism is “a worship of many deities which together form one divine polity, under the control of one supreme god.”

As regards the fundamental facts of Vedic worship, Müller's statements so

exaggerate their peculiarity as to convey, it is believed, a wholly wrong impression. It is very far from being true in any general way that the worship of one Vedic god excludes the rest from the worshipper's sight; on the contrary, no religion brings its gods into more frequent and varied juxtaposition and combination. The different offices and spheres of each are in constant contemplation. They are addressed in pairs: Indra-Agni, Indra-Varuna, Mitra-Varuna, Heaven and Earth, Dawn and Night, and a great many more. They are grouped in sets: the Adityas, the Maruts, Indra and the Maruts, and so on. They are divided into gods of the heaven, of the atmosphere, of the earth. And they are summed up as "all the gods" (*vīcē devās*), and worshipped as a body. Only, in the case of one or two gods often, and of a few others occasionally (and of many others not at all), the worshipper ascribes to the object of his worship attributes which might seem to belong to a sole god: never, indeed, calling him sole god, but extolling him as chief and mightiest of the gods, maker of heaven and earth, father of gods and men, and so on. This fact had been often enough noticed before Müller, but no one had had any difficulty in explaining it as a natural exaggeration, committed in the fervor of devotion. And it is in fact nothing else. This is evidenced by its purely occasional or even sporadic character, and by its distribution to its various objects. The office of Agni, as the fire, the god on earth, mediator and bearer of the sacrifice to the other gods, is as distinct as anything in Vedic religion, and the mass of his innumerable hymns are full of it; but he, in a few rare cases, is exalted by the ascription of more general and unlimited attributes. The exaggerations of the worship of Soma are unsurpassed, and a whole Book (the ninth) of the Rig-Veda is permeated with them: yet it is never forgotten that, after all, *soma* is only a drink, being purified for Indra and Indra's worshippers. The same exaltation forms a larger element in the worship of Indra, as, in fact, Indra comes nearest to the character of chief god, and in the later development of the religion actually attains in a certain subordinate way that character: but still, only as *primus inter pares*. These are typical cases. There is never a denial, never even an ignoring, of other and many other gods, but only a lifting up of the one actually in hand. And a plenty of evidence beside to the same effect is to be found. Such spurning of all limits in exalting the subject of glorification, such neglect of proportion and consistency, is throughout characteristic of the Hindu mind. The Atharva-Veda praises (xi. 6) even the *uchisṭa*, 'the remnant of the offering,' in a manner to make it almost supreme divinity: all sacrifices are in and through it, all gods and demigods are born of it, and so on; and its exaltation of *kāla*, 'time' (xix. 53, 54), is hardly inferior. And later, in epic story, every hero is smothered in laudatory epithets and ascriptions of attributes, till all individuality is lost; every king is master of the earth; every sage does penance by thousands of years, acquires unlimited power, makes the gods tremble, and threatens the equilibrium of the universe.

But this is exceptional only in its degree. No polytheist anywhere ever made an exact distribution of his worship to all the divinities acknowledged by him. Circumstances of every kind give his devotion special direction: as locality, occupation, family tradition, chance preference. Conspicuous among "henotheists" is that assembly which "with one voice about the space of two hours cried out 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians!'"—all other gods "disappeared for a moment from its vision." The devout Catholic, even, to no small extent, has his patron saint, his image or apparition of the Virgin, as recipient of his principal homage. If thus neither monotheism nor a monocratically ordered polytheism can repress this tendency, what exaggeration of it are we not justified in expecting where such restraints are wanting? And most of all, among a people so little submissive to checks upon a soaring imagination as the Indians?

The exaggeration of the Vedic poets never tends to the denial of multiple divinity, to the distinct enthronement of one god above the rest, or to a division of the people into Indra-worshippers and Agni-worshippers and Varuna-worshippers and so on. The Vedic *cultus* includes and acknowledges all the gods together. Its spirit is absolutely that of the verse, curiously quoted by Müller among his proof-texts of henotheism: "Among you, O gods, there is none that is small, none that is young; you all are great indeed." That is to say, there are an indefinite number of individual (Müller prefers to call them "single") gods,

independent, equal in godhood; and hence, each in turn capable of being exalted without stint. No one of them even arrives at supremacy in the later development of Indian religion; for that the name Vishnu is Vedic appears to be a circumstance of no moment. But, also according to the general tendencies of developing polytheism, there come to be supreme gods in the more modern period: Vishnu, to a part of the nation; Cîva, to another part; Brahman, to the eclectics and harmonizers. The whole people is divided into sects, each setting at the head of the universe and specially worshipping one of these, or even one of their minor forms, as Krishna, Jagannâtha, Durgâ, Râma.

Now it is to these later forms of Hindu religion, and to their correspondents elsewhere, that Müller would fain restrict the name of polytheism. To believe in many gods and in no one as of essentially superior rank to the rest is, according to him, to be a henotheist; to believe in one supreme god, with many others that are more or less clearly his underlings and ministers, is to be a polytheist! It seems sufficiently evident that, if the division and nomenclature were to be retained at all, the names would have to be exchanged. A pure and normal polytheism is that which is presented to us in the Veda; it is the primitive condition of polytheism, as yet comparatively undisturbed by theosophic reflection; when the necessity of order and gradation and a central governing authority makes itself felt, there has been taken a step in the direction of monotheism: a step that must be taken before monotheism is possible, although it may, and generally does, fail to lead to such a result.

It may be claimed, then, that henotheism, as defined and named by its inventor, is a blunder, being founded on an erroneous apprehension of facts, and really implying the reverse of what it is used to designate. To say of the Vedic religion that it is not polytheistic but henotheistic, is to mislead the unlearned public with a juggl of words. The name and the idea cannot be too rigorously excluded from all discussions of the history of religions. It is believed that they are in fact ignored by the best authorities.

After the usual vote of thanks to the authorities of the Divinity School for the hospitality shown it, the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston, on the 24th of May next.